

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/533,268

Applicant(s)

LIPSANEN, MATTI

Examiner

DAVID LAZARO

Art Unit

2455

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID LAZARO.

(3) _____

(2) David O'Neil(35,304).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12/22/08.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 54-68.

Identification of prior art discussed: 6,247,048(Greer) and 7,116,970(Brusilovsky).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David Lazaro/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455

12/22/09

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion was primarily directed towards the combination of Greer and Brusilovsky. The examiner explained the overall logic of the combination of references to further clarify how the references were being used in relation to the claimed subject matter. The examiner also suggested amendments to overcome the cited references. Applicant's attorney felt the combination of references was lacking in suggestion/motivation. As such, the examiner agreed to either more clearly explain the motivation/suggestion or possibly find different more suitable art.